

## REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-22 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-22 were rejected. Claim 22 was objected to. Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 17-18 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Claims 13 and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### **Drawing Objections**

Figure 2 was objected to because step 94 shown in Figure 2 is not mentioned in the Specification. Applicants have amended the paragraph beginning at page 16, line 28 of the Specification in order to correct this clerical error. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 22 was objected to by the Examiner due to informalities. Claim 22 is cancelled.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 4, 6, and 17 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis for particular recited terms. Applicants have amended Claims 4, 6, and 17 to overcome these clerical errors. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-16 and 18-21 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,192,480 issued to Jeff Barrus ("*Barrus*").

Applicants submit that *Barrus* (as well as *Roshal*) does not teach every element of Applicants' claims, as amended, as discussed below.

For example, regarding Claim 1, *Barrus* fails to teach:

displaying a user interface for locking the user preference setting for the first component; and

displaying a second component control for the second component, the second component control allowing the user to:

change the operation of the second component within a first range of settings if the user preference setting for the first component is not locked by the user; and

change the operation of the second component within a second range of settings smaller than the first range of settings if the user preference setting for the first component is locked by the user.

*Barrus* does not teach these elements. In fact, in the Examiner's rejection of dependent Claims 13 and 22 under § 103(a), the Examiner acknowledges that *Barrus* does not teach locking the operating status of one component such that modification of a related component is limited. (Office Action, Page 10).

*Roshal* also does not teach these elements of amended Claim 1. According to the Examiner, regarding dependent Claim 13 (which is now cancelled):

... Rochal teaches the program of instructions operable to lock the operating status (progress bar) of at least one component (extraction of a file in a .rar archive) such that modification (extraction) of one or more related components (other files in the .rar file) is limited by the defined operational links (location of the file within the archive) and the operating status of the locked component (password protected file)." (Office Action, Page 10)

Applicants disagree that these features of *Roshal* teach the elements of now-cancelled Claim 13. In any event, Applicants submit that *Roshal* certainly does not teach the elements of amended Claim 1 recited above.

First, *Roshal* does not disclose "displaying a user interface for locking the user preference setting for [a] first component." The progress bar shown in *Roshal* is not a "user interface" at all, much less a user interface for locking a user preference setting for a component.

Second, *Roshal* does not disclose displaying a second component control allowing a user to “change the operation of the second component within a first range of settings if the user preference setting for the first component is not locked by the user; and change the operation of the second component within a second range of settings smaller than the first range of settings if the user preference setting for the first component is locked by the user.” *Roshal* does not teach allowing a user to change the operation of a second component within different ranges of settings depending on whether a user has locked the user preference setting for a first component. In fact, nothing in *Roshal* can be equated with the “first range of settings” and “second range of settings smaller than the first range of settings” recited in amended Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, amended Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1, as well as Claims 2-7 that depend from amended Claim 1.

In addition, for analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claims 8 and 18, as well as all Claims that depend therefrom.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barrus*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,560,022 issued to Robert A. Dunstan et al. (“*Dunstan*”).

Applicants submit that Claims 4 and 17 are allowable at least because they depend from independent Claims 1 and 8, shown above to be allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 4 and 17.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants



Eric M. Grabski  
Reg. No. 33,790

Date: October 15, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

CUSTOMER NO. **23640**

512.322.2689

512.322.8383 (fax)